

BENEDICT XVI:

THE POPE WHO WANTS SUNDAY LAWS

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: RATZINGER OBSTRUCTED SEX-ABUSE CASES

Do you believe the following statement?

“Perhaps we, too, can gain by looking to Pope John Paul II as a good example of what it means to be a Christian. I find it ironic that we criticize Catholics for looking to one man who they consider appointed by God to be a leader in their church. Do we not do the same with Ellen White? Were they not both godly individuals [Ellen White and John Paul II] whom God used in a powerful way to lead His people [Adventists and Catholics] through hard times. I imagine if they met each other and looked back at their respective churches, they might both shake their heads and say with a sigh, ‘Oh, those rowdy kids.’ May we live in such a manner as to meet them both someday.”

Oh, you want to know who wrote it?

It was Alden Thompson, Professor of Church History at Walla Walla College, who teaches non-Adventist secularism to the youth you are foolish enough to send to that Adventist school.

Thompson’s statement is quoted from the April 14, 2005 edition of *The Collegian*, the official weekly newspaper of Walla Walla College, which is read by all the students.

Thompson concluded the above paragraph by stating that, *if we make it to heaven, we will be sure to meet John Paul II there.*

Will he be there? When John Paul was shot in the early 1980s, he called on the Virgin Mary, a dead woman, to save him. Softly, he said *totus tuus* (“all yours”). He was dedicating his life anew—not to God or to Jesus Christ—but to, what he considered as, a “departed spirit.” Dedication to departed spirits?

In his “will,” written over a period of several years, John Paul once again used that phrase: “I place it too in the hands of the Mother of my Master: *Totus Tuus.*”—And in one sentence, once again, he committed his life and his entire future after death—into the hands of Mary.

I feel very sorry for the poor man. He had trusted his salvation to the Catholic legends that dead people can save you from eternal death and deliver you into the future Kingdom of God’s dear Son.

All good Catholics may believe that John Paul is already in heaven; and Alden Thompson may believe that, when you get there, he will welcome you at the gate. But it is not true.

Let us now turn our attention to the new pope.

Several years ago, we reprinted an entire encyclical of John Paul II about the urgent need for Catholics throughout the world to honor Sunday and attend

church on that day. He also said that governments throughout the world should enact laws, so everyone could honor Sunday as a rest day.

In that encyclical, dated May 31, 1998, he, in effect, called for National Sunday Laws! (*Pope John Paul II Calls for National Sunday Laws [WM-843-846]*).

I have never believed that John Paul wrote that statement, nor any of his other official statements. Neither have I thought that he wrote the scripted speeches he gave—the oral ones, yes, but not the ones he read.

I assumed that, buried somewhere in the Vatican, there was a group of high level priests who wrote it all.

—Now I discover that all John Paul’s doctrinal statements were written by Cardinal Josef Ratzinger! The man who is his successor! It is Ratzinger who has been in charge of producing all Vatican doctrinal statements and position papers since 1981!

Here are these statements, written by Ratzinger to Catholic leaders and secular governments throughout the world!

“The fundamental importance of Sunday has been recognized through two thousand years of history and was emphatically restated by the Second Vatican Council.”—Page 2, section 3.

“Paul VI emphasized this importance once more when he approved the new General Roman Calendar and the Universal Norms which regulate the ordering of the Liturgical Year.”—Page 2, section 3. [This occurred near the conclusion of Vatican II, and primarily concerned a revised arrangement for yearly church festivals and holy days.]

“The coming of the Third Millennium, which calls believers to reflect upon the course of history in the light of Christ, also invites them to rediscover with new intensity the meaning of Sunday: its ‘mystery,’ its celebration, its significance for Christian and human life.”—Page 2, section 3.

“I note with pleasure that in the years since the [Vatican II] Council this important theme [of strengthening Sunday sacredness] has prompted not only many interventions by you, dear Brother Bishops, as teachers of the faith, but also different pastoral strategies which—with the support of your clergy—you have developed either individually or jointly. On the

threshold of the Great Jubilee of the Year 2000, it has been my wish to offer you this Apostolic Letter in order to support your pastoral efforts in this vital area.—Page 2, section 3.

“I reflect with you on the meaning of Sunday and underline the reasons for living Sunday as truly ‘the Lord’s Day,’ also **in the changing circumstances of our own times.**”—Page 2, section 3.

“Until quite recently, it was easier in traditionally Christian countries to keep Sunday holy because it was an almost universal practice and because, even in the organization of civil society, Sunday rest was considered a fixed part of the work schedule. Today, however, even in those countries which **give legal sanction** to the festive character of Sunday, changes in socioeconomic conditions have often led to the profound modifications of social behavior and hence of the character of Sunday. The custom of the ‘week-end’ has become more widespread, a weekly period of respite, spent perhaps far from home.”—Page 2, section 4.

“Because of the sociological pressures already noted, and perhaps because the motivation of faith is weak, the percentage of those attending the Sunday liturgy is strikingly low.”—Page 3, section 5.

“Given this array of new situations and the questions which they prompt, **it seems more necessary than ever to recover the deep doctrinal foundations underlying the Church’s precept, so that the abiding value of Sunday in the Christian life will be clear to all the faithful. In doing this, we follow in the footsteps of the age-old tradition of the Church.** powerfully restated by the Second Vatican Council in its teaching that on Sunday, ‘Christian believers should come together . . . [to receive the mass, etc.]’—Page 3, section 6.

“The duty to keep Sunday holy, especially by sharing in the Eucharist and by relaxing in a spirit of Christian joy and fraternity, is easily understood if we consider the many different aspects of this day upon which the present Letter will focus our attention.”—Page 3, section 7.

“I would strongly urge everyone to rediscover Sunday.”—Page 3, section 7.

“The Sabbath precept, which in the first Covenant prepares for the Sunday of the new and eternal Covenant, **is therefore rooted in the depths of God’s plan.** This is why, unlike many other precepts, **it is set** not within the context of strictly cultic stipulations but **within the Decalogue,** the ‘ten words’ **which represent the very pillars of the moral life** inscribed on the human heart. **In setting this commandment within the context of the basic structure of ethics, Israel and then the Church declare that they consider it not just a matter of community religious discipline but a defining and indelible expression of our relationship with God,** announced and expounded

by biblical revelation. **This is the perspective within which Christians need to rediscover this precept today.**—Pages 5-6, section 13.

“We celebrate Sunday because of the venerable Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we do so not only at Easter but also at the turning of the week; so wrote Pope Innocent I at the beginning of the fifth century, **testifying to an already well established practice which had evolved from the early years after the Lord’s Resurrection.**”—Page 7, section 19.

“Wise pastoral intuition suggested to the Church the christianization of the notion of Sunday as ‘the day of the sun,’ which was the Roman name for the day and which is retained in some modern languages. This was in order to draw the faithful away from the seduction of cults which worshipped the sun, and to direct the celebration of the day to Christ.”—Page 10, section 27.

“It is clear then why, even in our own difficult times, the identity of this day must be protected and above all must be lived in all its depth. An Eastern writer of the beginning of the third century recounts that as early as then the faithful in every region were keeping Sunday holy on a regular basis.”—Page 11, section 30.

“What began as a spontaneous practice later became a juridically sanctioned norm [i.e., National Sunday laws were enacted and enforced]. **The Lord’s Day has structured the history of the Church through two thousand years: how could we think that it will not continue to shape her future?**”—Page 11, section 30.

“Given its many meanings and aspects, and its link to the very foundations of the faith, **the celebration of the Christian Sunday remains, on the threshold of the Third Millennium, an indispensable element of our Christian identity.**”—Page 11, section 30.

“Even if in the earliest times it was not judged necessary to be prescriptive, the Church has not ceased to confirm this obligation of conscience [the urgency of requiring obedience to it], which rises from the inner need felt so strongly by Christians of the first centuries. **It was only later, faced with the half-heartedness or negligence of some, that the Church had to make explicit the duty to attend Sunday Mass; more often than not, this was done in the form of exhortation, but at times the Church had to resort to specific canonical precepts . . . These decrees** of local Councils **led to a universal practice,** the **obligatory character** of which was taken as something quite normal.”—Page 17, section 47.

“The Code of Canon Law of 1917 for the first time gathered this tradition into a universal law. **The present Code reiterates this, saying that ‘on Sundays and the other holy days of obligation the faithful are bound to attend Mass.’ This**

legislation has normally been understood as entailing a grave obligation: This is the teaching of the Catechism of the Catholic Church, and it is easy to understand why if we keep in mind how vital Sunday is for the Christian life.”—Page 17, section 47.

“It is the **special responsibility of the Bishops**, therefore, ‘to ensure that Sunday is appreciated by all the faithful, kept holy and celebrated as truly the ‘Lord’s Day.’ ”—Pages 17-18, section 48.

“For several centuries, Christians observed Sunday simply as a day of worship, without being able to give it the specific meaning of the Sabbath rest. **Only in the fourth century did the civil law of the Roman Empire recognize the weekly recurrence, determining that on ‘the day of the sun’ the judges, the people of the cities and various trade corporations would not work. Christians rejoiced to see thus removed the obstacles which until then had sometimes made observance of the Lord’s Day heroic [difficult]. They could now devote themselves to prayer in common without hinderance.**

“**It would therefore be wrong to see in this legislation of the rhythm of the week a mere historical circumstance with no special significance for the Church and which she could simply set aside. Even after the fall of the Empire, the Councils did not cease to insist upon the arrangements regarding Sunday rest.** In countries where Christians are in the minority and where the festive days of the calendar do not coincide with Sunday, it is still Sunday which remains the Lord’s Day, the day on which the faithful come together for the Eucharistic assembly. But this involves real sacrifices. For Christians it is not normal that Sunday, the day of joyful celebration, should not also be a day of rest, and it is difficult for them to keep Sunday holy if they do not have enough free time.

“By contrast **the link between the Lord’s Day and the day of rest in civil society [i.e., including non-Catholics] has a meaning and importance which go beyond the distinctly Christian point of view.** [The Sunday rest is needed by everyone.] **The alternation between work and rest, built into human nature, is willed by God Himself,** as appears in the creation story in the Book of Genesis (cf. 2:2-3; Ex. 20:8-11). Rest is something ‘sacred,’ because it is man’s way of withdrawing from the sometimes excessive demanding cycle of earthly tasks in order to review his awareness that everything is the work of God.”—Page 22, sections 64-65.

“Finally, it should not be forgotten that **even in our own day** work is very oppressive for many people, either because of miserable working conditions and long hours—especially in the poorer regions of the world—or because of the persistence in economically more developed societies of too many cases of injustice and exploitation of man by

man. [Everyone needs to stop work once a week.] **When through the centuries, she has made laws concerning Sunday rest, the Church has had in mind above all the work of servants and workers,** certainly not because this work was any less worthy when compared to the spiritual requirements of Sunday observance, but rather because **it needed greater regulation to lighten its burden and thus enable everyone to keep the Lord’s Day holy.** In this matter, my predecessor Pope Leo XIII in his *Encyclical Rerum Novarum* spoke of **Sunday rest as a worker’s right which the State must guarantee.**”—Page 23, section 66.

“**In our own historical context there remains the obligation to ensure that everyone can enjoy the freedom, rest and relaxation which human dignity requires, together with the associated religious, family, cultural and interpersonal needs which are difficult to meet if there is no guarantee of at least one day of the week on which people can both rest and celebrate.** Naturally, **this right of workers to rest** presupposes their right to work and, as we reflect on the question of the Christian understanding of Sunday, we cannot but recall with a deep sense of solidarity the hardship of countless men and women who, because of the lack of jobs, are forced to remain inactive on workdays as well.”—Page 23, section 66.

“Therefore, also **in the particular circumstances of our own time, Christians will naturally strive to ensure that civil legislation respects their duty to keep Sunday holy.** In any case, they are obliged in conscience to arrange their Sunday rest in a way which allows them to take part in the Eucharist, refraining from work and activities which are incompatible with the sanctification of the Lord’s Day, with its characteristic joy and necessary rest for spirit and body.”—Page 23, section 67.

“Dear Brothers and Sisters, **the imminence of the Jubilee invites us to a deeper spiritual and pastoral commitment. Indeed, this is its true purpose. In the Jubilee year, much will be done to give it the particular stamp demanded by the end of the second Millennium** and the beginning of the Third since the Incarnation of the Word of God. But this year and this special time will pass, as we look to other jubilees and other solemn events. As the weekly ‘solemnity,’ however, **Sunday will continue to shape the time of the Church’s pilgrimage,** until that Sunday which will know no evening.”—Page 29, section 87.

“Therefore, **dear Brother Bishops and Priests, I urge you to work tirelessly** with the faithful to ensure that the value of this sacred day is understood and lived ever more deeply. **This will bear rich fruit in Christian communities, and will not fail to have a positive influence on civil society as a whole.**”—Page 29, Section 87.

RATZINGER OBSTRUCTED SEX-ABUSE CASES

Pope Obstructed Sex-Abuse Inquiry Confidential Letter Reveals Ratzinger Ordered Bishops to Keep Allegations Secret *The Observer* - Britain, April 24, 2005

Pope Benedict XVI faced claims last night he had “obstructed justice” after it emerged **he issued an order ensuring the church’s investigations into child-sex abuse claims be carried out in secret.** The order was made in a confidential letter, obtained by *The Observer*, which was sent to every Catholic bishop in May 2001. **It asserted the church’s right to hold its inquiries behind closed doors and keep the evidence confidential for up to 10 years after the victims reached adulthood.** The letter was signed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who was elected as John Paul II’s successor last week.

Lawyers acting for abuse victims claim it was designed to prevent the allegations from becoming public knowledge or being investigated by the police. They accuse Ratzinger of committing a “clear obstruction of justice.”

The letter, “concerning very grave sins,” was sent from the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* [in earlier years, called “*The Inquisition*”], the Vatican office that once presided over the Inquisition and was overseen by Ratzinger.

It spells out to bishops the church’s position on a number of matters ranging from celebrating the eucharist with a non-Catholic to sexual abuse by a cleric “with a minor below the age of 18 years.” **Ratzinger’s letter states that the church can claim jurisdiction in cases where abuse has been “perpetrated with a minor by a cleric.”** The letter states that the church’s jurisdiction ‘begins to run from the day when the minor has completed the 18th year of age’ and lasts for 10 years. **It orders that “preliminary investigations” into any claims of abuse should be sent to Ratzinger’s office,** which has the option of referring them back to private tribunals in which the “functions of judge, promoter of justice, notary and legal representative can validly be performed for these cases only by priests.” “Cases of this kind are subject to the pontifical secret,” Ratzinger’s letter concludes.

Breaching the pontifical secret at any time while the 10-year jurisdiction order is operating carries penalties, including the threat of excommunication. [And all that time, the priest has been transferred to another parish where he can do it again.]

The letter is referred to in documents relating to a lawsuit filed earlier this year against a church in Texas and Ratzinger on behalf of two alleged abuse victims. By sending the letter, lawyers acting for the alleged victims claim the cardinal conspired to obstruct justice. Daniel Shea, the lawyer for the two alleged victims who discovered the letter, said: “It speaks for itself. **You have to ask: why do you not start the clock ticking until the kid turns 18? It’s an obstruction of justice.**”

F__ John Beal, professor of canon law at the Catholic University of America, gave an oral deposition under oath on 8 April last year in which he admitted to Shea that the letter extended the church’s jurisdiction and control over sexual assault crimes.

The Ratzinger letter was co-signed by Archbishop Tarcisio Bertone who gave an interview two years ago in which he hinted at **the church’s opposition to allowing outside agencies to investigate abuse claims.** “In my opinion, the demand that a bishop be obligated to contact the police in order to denounce a priest who has admitted to having committed the offence of paedophilia is unfounded,” Bertone said.

Shea criticized the order that abuse allegations should be investigated only in secret tribunals. “They are imposing procedures and secrecy on these cases. **If law enforcement agencies find out about the case, they can deal with it. But you can’t investigate a case if you never find out about it. If you can manage to keep it secret for 18 years plus 10 the priest will get away with it,**” Shea added. A spokeswoman in the Vatican press office declined to comment when told about the contents of the letter. **“This is not a public document, so we would not talk about it,”** she said.

HOW RATZINGER WAS ELECTED

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: A FEW ROMAN FACTS

They tried to get the stove fired up; but just as they poured chemicals in it to whiten the smoke, according to Chicago's Cardinal George, "The stove backed up, pouring smoke into the chapel." At first, only gray smoke emerged from the stovepipe.

But not long after, after a chorus of bells had sounded, the announcement was made from a window in St. Peter's: *Habemus Papam!* "We have a Pope!"

But how did it all happen? How did Ratzinger get elected instead of the *papabili*—the *potential candidates* that so many expected?

Two years ago, Cardinal Tettamanzi of Milan—an Italian, as so many wanted—was the favorite. Other front runners were cardinals in South and Central America.

But not Ratzinger. He was old; and he was too stern, too supportive of the old traditions in a modern world. He was also unusual in that he was willing to issue strong demands and push his ideas through to success.

It all started many years earlier.

Josef Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne who had to travel to Vatican II, remembered that the most brilliant priest in Germany was a young man named Ratzinger. So he took him along to be his theological adviser at the historic council.

It was not long before other church leaders attending Vatican II were surprised at the incisiveness of Ratzinger's mind. One was John XXIII's successor, Paul VI. He elevated Ratzinger to Archbishop of Munich; and then quickly, in the spring of 1977, he made him a cardinal.

The next year, Paul VI died and Ratzinger attended the conclave which elected John Paul I on August 26, 1978. Unfortunately, he was murdered 33 days later. (See my book, *The Murder of Pope John Paul I* for an understanding of why it happened and who probably did it.)

Both at that papal conclave and the next one, Ratzinger and a young cardinal from Poland became acquainted. After being elected as John Paul II on October 16, he searched for an archconservative to head the extremely important *Office of the Inquisition*. **In 1981 he appointed Ratzinger to the job.** (Later, to make it sound better, the name was changed to the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*.)

In 1986, Ratzinger unflinchingly got rid of Charles Curran, a theologian at the Catholic University of America (located in Washington, D.C., close to Takoma Park, Maryland), who had been voicing unorthodox views about contraception.

Another dissenter, punished by Ratzinger for his modernist positions, was Brazil's Leonardo Boff who had championed liberation theology. Before the recent conclave, Boff predicted that the "odious" Ratzinger "will never be pope." There were just too many modernists who opposed the German cardinal who was in charge of all doctrinal statements issuing from the Vatican.

From 1986 to 1992, Ratzinger supervised the writing of the new *Catholic Catechism*. He did most of the writing, along with a helper, Austria's Cardinal Schonborn.

Another problem to the church was Hans Kung, a very liberal theology teacher in Tübingen, Germany. In 1993, Kung remarked about Ratzinger, "He is very sweet . . . and very dangerous."

For 24 years Ratzinger had, single-handedly, masterminded every theological position of the entire world church! No little task, but it was a task Ratzinger could handle. When he sets his mind to getting Catholic theology enforced, he does it. —And he was the one who wrote John Paul II's 1998 encyclical, urging governments throughout the world to enforce Sunday observance (*See Benedict XVI: The Pope Who Wants Sunday Laws WM-1271*).

By the time of his death, John Paul II had appointed 115 new cardinals. All those over 80 (including many opposed to Ratzinger) were ineligible to vote. John Paul II had stacked the College of Cardinals with men who would tend to favor his conservative views.

After October 2003, most of the prominent cardinals passed the voting age limit of 80. Cardinal Martini was the only one of stature still able to rally cardinals to the liberal cause. But in 2002, the pope had approved his transfer to a scholarship position in Jerusalem, where he would have less influence.

In contrast, John Paul II was careful not to let Ratzinger give up his several bureaucratic jobs in the Curia, although he offered to do so twice.

Among other duties, Ratzinger was dean of the College of Cardinals. Another significant fact was that, out of a total of 117 cardinals, Ratzinger was one of only two cardinals who had not been appointed by John Paul II.

In 2004, Ratzinger, instead of slowing down, seemed energized—and poured forth still more theological position papers. **He was managing the church while John Paul II spent his time traveling all over the world. —And that is exactly what the two of them had been doing together for over 20 years!**

Writing several articles for key Italian newspa-

pers in 2004, Ratzinger was able to quench Italian desire for “an Italian pope.” He had become the cardinal that Italian conservative church leaders wanted for the next pope.

In February 2005, as John Paul was admitted to the hospital, Ratzinger delivered a powerful sermon at the funeral of the founder of *Communion and Liberation*, a very influential Catholic lay movement, and received enthusiastic applause. His leading rival, Tettamanzi of Milan, left the gathering shaken.

For the Good Friday sermon, with John Paul near death, Ratzinger gave an utterly daring sermon, declaring that the Church needed to be “cleansed from filth.” This caused many, many Catholics to regard him as the sole towering priest of strength who was needed to guide the Church in the years to come.

Then John Paul died; and cardinals from around the world arrived at Rome for the forthcoming conclave. Turning to officials in the Curia for counsel, they were pointed to Ratzinger as the man they should go to for counsel.

One priest close to Ratzinger later said, “It’s a fact that most cardinals don’t know most other cardinals. They get to know each other in Rome. And how do they get to know each other? They ask the Curia Cardinals.”

As a result, the person everyone wanted to meet was Ratzinger, a quiet man with a warm smile—when he is smiling.

On the Saturday before the conclave, he turned 78. For days he had been impressing cardinals by speaking to them in German, French, English, Italian, and Spanish.

Ratzinger was at center stage at every important event. He led out at John Paul’s funeral, at the first of the *novemdiales* masses (held on the nine days after a pope’s funeral), as chairman of the cardinals’ daily congregation meetings, at the preconclave mass.

For two full weeks—Ratzinger was in charge of everything at the Vatican. And, as the one who made all the decisions, he made sure that he gave all the sermons and homilies, was in charge of all the masses, and chaired all the cardinals’ meetings.

Then, on the Monday morning of the conclave, he delivered a powerful speech to the cardinals, declaring that he would not compromise his positions in order to win votes. At that meeting, he was only supposed to present to the cardinals general principles for electing the next pope—not provide them with a political speech about his own candidacy.

The liberals had arrived in Rome, fully believing that Ratzinger could not possibly be elected. But they quickly changed their minds.

The conclave began on Monday afternoon. Cardinal Martini of Milan tried to blunt Ratzinger’s lead, but Ratzinger was already solidly ahead in the first

balloting. The rest of the votes were spread among several Italians; and, according to one cardinal, several ballots were left blank.

Cardinal Ruini, the vicar of Rome, kept the Italian cardinals with Ratzinger. Many of the 20 cardinals from Latin America quickly joined with his supporters. They liked his traditionalist positions.

The second ballot saw Ratzinger reach 60 votes. By the third, he was only a few votes short of the 77 required for the papacy. By the fourth, he had won 95 votes from the 115 cardinals present.

Why should this be a surprise? **The man who had been in charge of the Vatican for 24 years had won.** Interestingly enough, twice he had offered his resignation from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith; but each time John Paul refused to let his penman leave the Vatican.

One liberal left the conclave grumbling: “A good conclave is one where there are at least two candidates deadlocked; a bad one is where there’s one dominant figure. That was the case this time.”

Belgium’s Cardinal Danneels was one of the few prelates to voice disappointment publicly. Benedict XVI was “the choice of the college [of cardinals],” he told a Flemish newspaper. “Whether he was an ideal candidate is another matter.”

Upon learning that Ratzinger had become pope, President George W. Bush praised him as a “man of great wisdom . . . who serves the Lord.”

In his *Memorandum to Cardinal Theodore E. McCarrick* (2004), Ratzinger had earlier written:

“A Catholic would be guilty of formal cooperation in evil, and so unworthy to represent himself for holy communion, if he were to deliberately vote for a candidate precisely because of the candidate’s permissive stand in favor of abortion and/or euthanasia.”

It was Ratzinger who wrote the 1998 encyclical, urging prelates and governmental leaders to enact strict Sunday laws (*See Benedict XVI: The Pope Who Wants Sunday Laws WM-1271*). Would the above statement also include as sin decisions made by voters or politicians not to vote for Sunday laws?

As one newspaper put it:

“By all accounts, the new Pope Benedict XVI is known neither for charisma nor a propensity for reform. Quite the contrary, he is described as an immovable advocate of strict Catholic tradition in almost every area, one who challenges—and has suppressed—momentum for reform.”—*Chattanooga Times*, April 20, 2005.

Have you read chapter 35 (*Aims of the Papacy*) of *Great Controversy* lately? It spells out in detail the “strict Catholic tradition” that Benedict XVI stands for.

—vf

A FEW ROMAN FACTS

What You Didn't Know about the Popes of Rome

- Excerpted from an unpublished article by Mark Owen, a free-lance Protestant writer - April 6, 2005—

The triple sovereignty of the pope is distinct in fact and in law. Internationally, he is not subject to any authority on earth. His cardinals are considered to be Princes of the Church and peers of the sons of reigning monarchs. Each diocese is considered to be a royal fiefdom. The word, "diocese," originally signified an administrative unit devised by the Emperor Diocletian, a tyrant noted for his persecution of Christians.

Following are brief sketches of some of the more interesting holders of the title, "Vicar of Christ." (It should be noted that the Latin equivalent of the Greek "anti" is "vicarius," from whence is derived the word, "vicar.") [In Greek, "anti" can mean "against"; thus "Vicar of Christ" = "against Christ," or "anti-Christ." *vf*]

Without a doubt, there was one pope who was completely mad. In 896 **Stephen VII** set in motion the trial of his rival, the late Pope **Formosus** who had been dead for 9 months at the time. Formosus' corpse was dragged from its tomb and arrayed on a throne in the council chamber. The corpse, wrapped in a hair shirt, was provided with council, who wisely remained silent while Pope Stephen raved and screamed at it. The crime of Formosus was that he had crowned as emperor one of the numerous illegitimate heirs of Charlemagne after first having performed the same office for a candidate favored by Stephen.

After Stephen's rant, the corpse was stripped of its clothes and its fingers were chopped off. It was then dragged through the palace and hurled from a balcony to a howling mob, below, who threw it into the Tiber. The body was later rescued by people sympathetic to Formosus and given a quiet burial.

Stephen was strangled to death a few years later.

In 964 Pope **Benedict V** raped a young girl and absconded to Constantinople with the papal treasury, only to reappear when the money ran out. Church historian, Gerbert, called Benedict "the most iniquitous of all the monsters of ungodliness." The pontiff was eventually slain by a jealous husband. His corpse, bearing a hundred dagger wounds, was dragged through the streets before being tossed into a cesspit.

In October 1032 the papal miter was purchased for the 11-year old **Benedict IX**. Upon reaching his 14th year, a chronicler wrote that Benedict had already surpassed in wantonness and profligacy all who had preceded him. He often had to leave Rome in a hurry.

Gregory VII was a master forger, surpassing even the great fraud known as the *Donation of Constantine*, the document that created the Papal States. Gregory had an entire school of forgers turning out document after document bearing the papal seal of approval. These documents were later systematized in the mid-1100s in Bologna by Gratian, a Benedictine monk. He called his work the *Decretum*, or Code of Canon Law. It was

peppered throughout with several centuries of forgeries along with Gratian's own fictional additions.

Gregory also formalized the celibacy doctrine in order to curtail the many gifts of church lands being given away to all of the illegitimate children of priests and bishops. According to Catholic historian Peter de Rosa in his book, *Vicars of Christ*: "Popes had mistresses as young as fifteen years of age, were guilty of incest and sexual perversions of every sort, had innumerable children, were murdered in the very act of adultery. In the old Catholic phrase, why be holier than the Pope?"

Another interesting figure was **Alexander VI** (formerly **Rodrigo Borgia**). He reigned from 1492-1503. Alexander committed his first murder at the age of 12. Upon assuming the Papal miter he cried, "I am Pope, Vicar of Christ!" In his *Decline and Fall [of the Roman Empire]*, Gibbon referred to Alexander as the Tiberius of Rome. Like his predecessor **Innocent VIII**, Alexander sired many children, baptized them personally and officiated at their weddings in the Vatican. He had ten known illegitimate children (including the notorious **Cesare** and **Lucrezia [Borgia]**) by his favorite mistress Vannoza Catanei. When she faded, Borgia took the 15-year old Giulia Farnese. Farnese obtained a cardinal's red hat for her brother who later became Paul III.

Alexander was followed by **Julius II**, who purchased the papacy with his own private fortune. He didn't even pretend to be a Christian. A notorious womanizer who sired any number of bastards, Julius was so eaten away with syphilis that he couldn't even expose his foot to be kissed. Under **Leo X** (1513-1521)—who cursed and excommunicated Martin Luther—specific prices were enumerated by the Roman Chancery for every imaginable crime. For instance, a deacon accused of murder could be absolved for 20 crowns. Once pardoned, he could not be prosecuted by civil authorities.

Two hundred years earlier, **John XXII** had done much the same thing, setting prices for crimes ranging from incest to sodomy.

During his pontificate **Innocent VIII** (1484-1492) granted a 20-year *Butterbriefe* indulgence to persons who met his price. For a sum, one could purchase the privilege of eating favorite dishes during Lent.

Leo X (Giovanni de Medici) commissioned the Dominican friar, Tetzl, to sell indulgences which released one from purgatory. Tetzl's famous refrain went, "As soon as the coin in the coffer rings, a soul from purgatory springs!"

Pope **Sixtus IV** charged Roman brothels a "Church Tax." According to historian Will Durant, in 1490 there were 6,800 registered prostitutes in Rome. **Pius II** declared that Rome was the only city run by bastards (the sons of popes and cardinals). The iniquity of the various popes has filled many books; and one has to wonder if the Church has been cursed from the very beginning. After all, Constantine leveled the Stadium of

Caligula and the Temple of Apollo and used the stones and marble from them to erect the original basilica of Peter. Martin Luther, centuries later, declared, "If there is a Hell, Rome is built over it. It is an abyss from whence issues every kind of sin."

Very brief mention should be made of the staggering scale of the **Inquisition**. In his *History of the Inquisition*, Canon Llorente, who was Secretary of the Inquisition in Madrid from 1790-1792, estimated the number of condemned in Spain alone to have exceeded 3 million, with 300,000 burned at the stake.

A Catholic historian comments on the events leading up to the suppression of the Spanish Inquisition: "When Napoleon conquered Spain in 1808, a Polish officer in his army, Col. Lemanouski, reported that the Dominicans (in charge of the Inquisition) blockaded themselves in their monastery in Madrid. When Lemanouski's troops forced an entry, the inquisitors denied the existence of any torture chambers. The soldiers searched the monastery and discovered them under the floors. The chambers were full of prisoners, all naked, many insane. The French troops, used to cruelty and blood, could not stomach the sight. They emptied the torture chambers, laid gunpowder to the monastery and blew the place up."

Rome was truly drunk with the Martyrs' blood. And the Papacy isn't fairing much better in our modern age; it would appear to be in serious decline, if not in outright defeat.

In November 2000 Italian headlines screamed, "*Devil Defeats Pope!*" [The Roman newspaper] *Il Messaggero* reported that the pope had been confronted by a teenage girl in the Vatican who screamed insults in a cavernous voice during an audience. John Paul attempted an exorcism, but his ministrations had no effect on the girl.

Devils in the Vatican would come as no surprise to Msgr. Luigi Marinelli. His book, *Gone With the Wind*, at the Vatican fairly flew off the shelves in Italy, revealing as it did stories of money-laundering prelates, sex abuse, and satanic rituals performed within the walls of the Holy See.

Marinelli's comments echo those of the late Malachi Martin, a former Jesuit and exorcist, whose 1990 book, *The Keys of this Blood*, contains the following disturbing information:

"Most frighteningly for John Paul, he had come up against the irremovable presence of a malign strength in his own Vatican and in certain bishops' chanceries. It was what knowledgeable churchmen called *the superforce*. Rumors, difficult to verify, tied its installation to the beginning of Paul VI's reign in 1963. Indeed, Paul had alluded somberly to 'the smoke of Satan which has entered the Sanctuary'—an oblique reference to an enthronement ceremony performed by satanists in the

Vatican.

"The incidence of satanic pedophilia—rites and practices—was already documented among certain bishops and priests as widely dispersed as Turin in Italy and South Carolina in the United States. The cultic acts of satanic pedophilia are considered by professionals to be the culmination of the Fallen Archangel's Rites."

The verdict on the pederasty, that is endemic to the Roman priesthood, is in. The Church paid out more than \$1 billion in claims to victims of sex abuse by clergy in the 1990s alone. And the American branch offers a very disturbing treatment method to offenders. One startling example should suffice:

Fr. Jay Mullin was accused of molesting a boy more than 20 years ago in Boston. Then Cardinal Bernard Law commanded Mullin to be evaluated at *St. Luke's Institute*. The Institute is a Washington clinic that was profiled in a *Boston Globe* article of February 24, 2002:

"Mullin was flown south in 1992 to a clinic outside Washington, D.C. The church-run clinic had a huge collection of child pornography of varying degrees, which ranged from soft porn to hardcore S&M images, all featuring preteen boys and girls."

This would have to rate as the most devilish form of aversion therapy ever known. It would be akin to treating alcoholics with copious quantities of vintage wine or bombarding junkies with free packets of China White heroin. Truly degenerate and depraved lunatics were running the asylum, known as St. Luke's.

Notwithstanding the scandal and shock of the aforementioned, Rome carries on quietly with her program of world dominion. They lead the competition to establish the first one-world system that has ever existed. Their ultimate goal is global religious syncretism and to eventually wield control and authority over every individual on earth. The human solidarity goals of the Roman Church are identical to the goals and objectives of the United Nations. This is why they are such a perfect fit. Rome only gives the appearance of objecting to the UN agenda.

At the 1996 World Food Summit in Rome, Cardinal Angelo Sodana pledged the Holy See's support for the UN's humanistic *Programs of Action*.

Rome also has designs on Jerusalem. For 46 years after Israel's rebirth, the Vatican refused to acknowledge Israel's right to exist. But Rome wants to exert premier influence over Jerusalem. In a 1993 letter to the Pope **Shimon Peres promised to internationalize Jerusalem, granting the UN political control of the Old City and the Vatican hegemony over the holy sites within**. This was confirmed by the Italian newspaper, *La Stampa*.

In March 1995 the Israeli radio station, *Arutz Sheva*, was leaked a cable from the Israeli Embassy in Rome, confirming the hand-over of Jerusalem to the Vatican.